



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

14

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,174	09/10/2003	Deborah Ann Evrard	WYNC-0324 (AM101200NP)	7478
23377	7590	10/01/2004	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR 1650 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			SEAMAN, D MARGARET M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/659,174	EVRARD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	D. Margaret Seaman	1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 1-26 and 30 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 27-29 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

This application was filed 10 September 2003 and claims priority to Provisional Application 60/410,072 (9/12/2002). Claims 1-30 are before the Examiner.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The IDS of 1/28/2004 has been considered in part. The references that were not supplied have not been considered. Applicant must supply the references. Also, if applicant wants the Examiner to consider all of the reference, then a statement must be supplied as to the significance of the reference. If applicant wants only a few pages of the references considered, then those pages should be specified and provided by Applicant. Due to this, references 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 15 and 18 have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
3. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention. The instant specification does not adequately describe the nexus between the modulation of both serotonin uptake and antagonism of 5HT_{1A} receptor and a useful treatment of a disease/condition. Modulation of a receptor involves antagonism, inhibition, agonism and others. These modulations are sometimes opposite reactions to the same receptor. It is not seen where the instant specification adequately describes the nexus between the modulation of the both serotonin uptake and antagonism of 5HT_{1A} receptor and a useful treatment of a single disease or condition.

4. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art, 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor, 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention

based on the content of the disclosure. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

- 1) The breadth of the claims,
- 2) The nature of the invention,
- 3) The state of the prior art,
- 4) The level of one of ordinary skill,
- 5) The level of predictability in the art,
- 6) The amount of direction provided by the inventor,
- 7) The existence of working examples,
- 8) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The nature of the invention: The nature of the invention is the method of treating a disorder that is modulated by both serotonin uptake and antagonism of 5HT_{1A}.

The state of the prior art: The state of the prior art is that it involves screening in vitro and in vivo to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities (i.e. what compounds can treat which specific disease). There is no absolute predictability even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face.

The predictability in the art: It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. In re Fisher, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant case, the instantly claimed invention is highly unpredictable since one

skilled in the art would recognize that in regards to the therapeutic effects of all diseases, whether or not the modulation of both serotonin uptake and antagonism of 5HT_{1A} receptors would make a difference in the disease. Hence, in the absence of a showing of a nexus between any and all known diseases and the modulation of both serotonin uptake and antagonism of 5HT_{1A} receptors, one of ordinary skill in the art is unable to fully predict possible results from the administration of the compound of claim 1 due to the unpredictability of the role of modulation of both serotonin uptake and antagonism of 5HT_{1A} receptors.

The presence or absence of working examples: Compounds have been tested for the antagonism of 5HT_{1A} receptor (see pages 30-31 of the instant specification). However, there is no testing for the inhibition of serotonin uptake.

The amount of direction or guidance present: The guidance present in the specification is that it is highly desirable to provide improved compounds which both inhibit serotonin reuptake and which are antagonists of the 5HT_{1A} receptor (page 2 paragraph 9). However the instant compounds have only been tested to be antagonists of the 5HT_{1A} receptor (see pages 30-30). The specification teaches that both serotonin inhibition and antagonism of 5HT_{1A} receptor must be done for the instant method of treatment to be successful. The specification only shows the antagonism of 5HT_{1A} receptor. Due to this, it is not seen where the instant specification enables a correlation between the mediation of both serotonin uptake and antagonism of 5HT_{1A} receptors

and the treatment of any and all diseases when only the 5HT_{1A} receptor antagonism has been shown.

The breadth of the claims: The claims are drawn to the treatment of many diseases mediated by both serotonin uptake and antagonism of 5HT_{1A} with the compound of claim 1.

The quantity of experimentation needed: The quantity of experimentation needed is undue. One skilled in the art would need to determine what diseases out of all known diseases would be benefited by only the antagonism of the 5HT_{1A} receptor rather than both serotonin uptake inhibition and antagonism of 5HT_{1A}.

The level of the skill in the art: The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by in vitro and in vivo screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

Thus, the specification fails to provide sufficient support of the broad use of the compounds of claim 1 for the treatment of any disease. As a result necessitating one of ordinary skill to perform an exhaustive search for which diseases can be treated by which compound of claim 1 in order to practice the claimed invention.

Genentech Inc. v. Novo Nordisk A/S (CA FC) 42 USPQ2d 1001, states that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its

successful conclusion" and "[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable".

Therefore, in view of the Wands factors and In re Fisher (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, one of ordinary skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to test which diseases can be treated by the compounds of the instant claims, with no assurance of success.

This rejection can be overcome by deleting the claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. The claims 1-26 and 30 are free of prior art. The closest art is as follows: Mewshaw (US Patent #6,162,803 and WO 99/51592). Mewshaw teaches similar indol derivatives for the treatment of depression. However, the benzoxozine moiety of the compound of Mewshaw does not have the third fused heteroring as is instantly claimed. Due to this, the claims 1-26 and 30 are free of prior art.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Margaret Seaman whose telephone number is 571-272-0694. The examiner can normally be reached on 630am-4pm, First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecelia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



D. Margaret Seaman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1625

dms